

Application No. 10/814,457  
Response Dated 12/1/2006  
Reply to Office Action of 10/16/2006  
Page 6 of 9

**REMARKS:**

These remarks are in response to the final Office Action mailed October 16, 2006, in which claims 12, 14-21, 23-25, 27 and 28 are pending. Claims 13, 22, 26 and 30 have previously been canceled. Claims 1-11 and 29 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected species. Claims 12, 14-21, 23-25, 27 and 28 stand rejected.

The Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following amendments and contends that no new search is required as these amendments incorporate recitations of a dependent claim into the independent claim. In the present response claim 12 has been amended to incorporate recitations of claim 21 that the substrate of the present application comprises at least one of "silicon, amorphous metal, ceramic, polymeric material, amorphous glass and silicon dioxide." No new matter was added in making these amendments. Claim 21 has been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 12, 14-21, 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Altena et al (US Patent number 6,327,784), hereinafter Altena in view of Hastings (U.S. Patent number 3,654,701).

In making the rejection the Examiner states that Altena teaches a steel razor blade. As previously mentioned, claim 12 has been amended to recite the substrate of the present application comprises at least one of "silicon, amorphous metal, ceramic, polymeric material, amorphous glass and silicon dioxide." The Applicant contends that Altena fails to disclose, teach or suggest a substrate comprising the aforementioned recitation.

The disclosure of Hastings is directed to an improved safety razor blade having a cutting edge in the form of a continuous series of substantially sinusoidal microwaves. As the Applicant argued in the response dated August 24, 2006, Hastings is silent in regard to any coatings on the cutting edge or the composition of the substrate of his improved razor blade.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success.

Application No. 10/814,457  
Response Dated 12/1/2006  
Reply to Office Action of 10/16/2006  
Page 7 of 9

Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The Applicant contends that the Altena and Hastings, alone or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest a substrate comprising at least one of "silicon, amorphous metal, ceramic, polymeric material, amorphous glass and silicon dioxide" as recited in claim 12. The Applicant therefore contends that claim 12 is allowable over Altena and Hastings.

Dependent claims, by definition, further define the subject matter of the independent claim from which they depend. Because claims 14-20, 23 and 25 depend from claim 12, these claims add recitations that further define the subject matter of independent claim 12. As claim 12 is believed to be allowable, claims 14-20, 23 and 25 are therefore also believed to be allowable. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 12, 14-20, 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Altena in view of Hastings. The rejection of claim 21 is moot as this claim has been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the modified device of Altena in view of Goel et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,795,648), hereinafter Goel.

For at least the reasons stated previously, the Applicant contends that the modified device of Altena fails to disclose teach or suggest a substrate comprising at least one of "silicon, amorphous metal, ceramic, polymeric material, amorphous glass and silicon dioxide."

The disclosure of Goel is directed to "[a] method for preserving the precision-edges of a precision-edged substrate by applying to the substrate a corrosion resistant coating." The disclosure of Goel is silent regarding the composition of the substrate.

The Applicant contends that the modified device of Altena and Goel, alone or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest a substrate comprising at least one of "silicon, amorphous metal, ceramic, polymeric material, amorphous glass and silicon dioxide" as recited in claim 12 and thus claim 24, being dependent on claim 12 and adding recitations that further define the subject matter of claim 12. The Applicant therefore contends that claim 24 is allowable and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the

Application No. 10/814,457  
Response Dated 12/1/2006  
Reply to Office Action of 10/16/2006  
Page 8 of 9

rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over the modified device of Altena in view of Goel.

The Examiner rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the modified device of Altena in view of Balke (U.S. Patent No. 6,382,068).

For at least the reasons stated previously, the Applicant contends that the modified device of Altena fails to disclose teach or suggest a substrate comprising at least one of "silicon, amorphous metal, ceramic, polymeric material, amorphous glass and silicon dioxide."

The disclosure of Balke is directed to a strip-shaped or reciprocating knife, however Balke's disclosure is silent regarding the composition of the substrate.

The Applicant contends that the modified device of Altena and Balke, alone or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest a substrate comprising at least one of "silicon, amorphous metal, ceramic, polymeric material, amorphous glass and silicon dioxide" as recited in claim 12 and thus claim 27, being dependent on claim 12 and adding recitations that further define the subject matter of claim 12. The Applicant therefore contends that claim 27 is allowable and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over the modified device of Altena in view of Balke.

The Examiner rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over the modified device of Altena in view of Trankiem (U.S. Patent No. 5,101,565).

For at least the reasons stated previously, the Applicant contends that the modified device of Altena fails to disclose teach or suggest a substrate comprising at least one of "silicon, amorphous metal, ceramic, polymeric material, amorphous glass and silicon dioxide."

The disclosure of Trankiem is directed to an improved razor blade and method of production. The cutting edge regions of the razor blade of the Trankiem patent include a solid adherent coating which is the residue of a heated mixture of a fluorocarbon polymer and a silane. Each and every embodiment of Trankiem comprises a substrate formed of "carbon or

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 01 2006

Application No. 10/814,457  
Response Dated 12/1/2006  
Reply to Office Action of 10/16/2006  
Page 9 of 9

stainless steels" (Col 1, lines 49-50). This is not what is recited in claim 12 and thus dependent claim 28 of the present application.

The Applicant contends that the modified device of Altena and Trankiem, alone or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest a substrate comprising at least one of "silicon, amorphous metal, ceramic, polymeric material, amorphous glass and silicon dioxide" as recited in claim 12 and thus claim 28, being dependent on claim 12 and adding recitations that further define the subject matter of claim 12. The Applicant therefore contends that claim 28 is allowable and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over the modified device of Altena in view of Trankiem.

**SUMMARY:**

In summary, the Applicant believes that the foregoing remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein are allowable. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the present application be passed onto allowance.

The Applicant believes that no additional fees are due with the filing of the present response, however, if any additional fees are due, please charge Deposit Account No 503342 maintained by the Attorneys of the Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David C. Coffin  
Registration No. 57,908

Michaud-Duffy Group LLP  
306 Industrial Park Road, Suite 206  
Middletown, CT 06457-1532  
Phone: (860) 632-7200  
Fax: (860) 632-8269